

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (HWG)

Conference Call Notes of the Call on July 12, 2005

Draft of July 14, 2005

The Hydrology and Water Quality Working Group (HWG) conferred by phone at 3:00 p.m. Central on June 12. The following is a summary of topics in that call.

Participants

Facilitator: JOSEPH MCMAHON

Participant list for our call (advise me of any missing or incorrectly listed names):

DAVID BARFIELD, KANSAS DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES; DON JORGENSEN, MISSOURI RIVER TECHNICAL GROUP; JEFF SHAFER, NEBRASKA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES; JOAN STEMLER, US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS; JOE GIBBS, MISSOURI LEVEE & DRAINAGE DISTRICT ASSOCIATION; JOHN SHADLE, NEBRASKA PUBLIC POWER DISTRICT; MARK RATH, SOUTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES; MIKE LEVALLEY, US FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE; ROBERT L. PEARCE, US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, RET.; WAYNE STANCILL, US FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE; ROBB JACOBSON, US GEOLOGICAL SURVEY; DR. DAVID GALAT, US GEOLOGICAL SURVEY; DALE BLEVINS, US GEOLOGICAL SURVEY; MIKE SWENSON, USACE; MIKE OLSEN, USFWS JOHN DREW, MISSOURI DEPT OF NAT RESOURCES.

Deleted:

Our Path Forward/schedule.

Date	Event	Who
Monday, July 18, 2005, 1 p.m. Central Time, 12 noon Mountain; 202-275-0166 and access code is 6211#	HWG conference call	All Group Members
Wednesday, July 20, 2005, 9 a.m., Hill Meeting Room @ The Hilton Omaha at 1001 Cass St, Omaha, NE	Technical Working Group Meeting (starting in a combined meeting)	All Group Members
Tuesday, July 26, 2005, NPS Office, 601 Riverfront Drive, Omaha, NE 68102	Technical Working Group representatives present information to the full Plenary Group	Representatives selected by the HWG

Topics for our upcoming July 18, 2005 conference call.

1. Any further needed consideration of the Pallid Sturgeon Group proposals and how the Hydrology Group should respond to them.
 - a. What new data has Pallid Sturgeon Group provided to us?
 - b. In what ways, if any, does the Hydrology Group recommend adjustments to the Pallid Sturgeon Group proposals to account for the needs/interests of other stakeholders?

- c. Can we or how can we effectively combine the Pallid Sturgeon Group concepts with those of the Hydrology Group?
2. Focusing our efforts on the goal of recommendations to the Plenary: Is this Group ready to draft specific proposals to the Plenary?
3. Use of a standardized form for recommendations.
4. Use of an initial meeting in Omaha on July 20 to blend the knowledge and wisdom of the Pallid Sturgeon Group and Hydrology Group.
5. How to use stop protocols, precludes and prorates changes on proposals to the Plenary.
6. Other agenda items added by the Hydrology Group.
7. Work items before July 20:
 - a. Who is coming to Omaha on July 20 with some proposals for review?
 - b. What other assessment or modeling is needed?

Key discussion topics on our July 12, 2005 conference call.

Pallid Sturgeon Group proposals. These data were discussed at length and more recent documents reviewed. The Pallid Sturgeon Group reiterates this is a document in process and it will change over time.

Documents. Most or all documents relevant to the are posted at www.jpmmcMahon.com/springrise.html. The Pallid Sturgeon Group notes that its concepts for Spring Rise are to aid the Pallid Sturgeon and do not purport to address other relevant constraints on the Spring Rise – that must come from other Technical Groups. The only ways in which the Pallid Sturgeon Group proposals are tempered are: (a) selection of lower third and lower percentile years (reflecting water shortage) and (b) suggesting dates that respond to Plover/Tern nesting.

Water temperature. A question was raised about whether, by dealing with the Plover/Tern nesting, does the Pallid Sturgeon Group proposal now move the date of the rise to a time that does not properly correspond to the proper water temperature point.

Shallow water habitat. Questions were raised as to whether there is sufficient data about shallow water habitat to know how the Second Rise is working.

Mark Rath et al documents. We reviewed and discussed. Mark explained that these documents were developed by others and that he/others “do not own these.” Rather, this is a way to show what is being discussed. The Hydrology Group seems to believe this format is suitable for making proposals to the Plenary Group. We think that 3-4 page proposals are appropriate so we do not overload the Plenary with data and documents.

COE modeling. Mike Swenson commented on status of modeling, revisions to Table 2. A person has been engaged to undertake UNET modeling to help with peaks and attenuation. Some participants request that the attenuation modeling go beyond St. Joe so the lower River has better data on impacts. The Pallid Sturgeon Group does want the modeling to be run using peaks and Mike states that the COE model can now run using short duration peaks. The COE requests that

stakeholders not overload the modeling process and run only those options that really merit consideration or that otherwise provide valuable data.

Water quality. Dale Blevins' work was thought to be a good starting point.

Water availability (stop protocols, precludes and rationing). This has been a topic that some feel needs much more attention. David Barfield notes that he believes there are three considerations:

1. Scaling (prorate adjustments to reduce the volume of water in Rises based on availability).
2. A stop protocol where the Rise must stop (we know about this in some ways from COE modeling of plateaus but not yet with peaks).
3. A stop based on not only storage but also flow projections (May projections are better than March but late projections provide downstream users with less planning notice)

Flood control constraints appear to be the real lid on downstream negative effects.

Are better options emerging? The Group needs additional time to consider the new documents before making decisions.

John Drew proposal concept. John stated that he had a new concept for framing a proposal for the Plenary that he would send out via email.

Deleted: ¶

Post script. A question has been raised as to whether the USGS is staying in its "resource" role or become an advocate of particular positions.

Limitations on this Summary Document: Plenary and Technical Working Group meeting notes are intended to be a general summary of key issues raised and discussed by participants at meetings. The presentation of issues or items discussed is not designed to be totally comprehensive, or reflect the breadth or depth of discussions. However, it is intended to record the gist of conversations and conclusions. Where a consensus or other agreement was reached, it will be so noted. Where ideas or comments are from only one or several participants, or where a brainstormed list is presented, the content of which was not agreed to by all group members, the recorders will to the best of their abilities note these qualifiers. When participants raise comments about the meeting notes, or make other suggestions or comments following meetings which are more than "corrections," we will add these in a section at the end of the meeting notes captioned "Post Script."

This Conference Call Summary is the independent work product of the mediation team from CDR Associates, an independent conflict management firm working under contract to the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, which is serving in a neutral capacity to assist in the resolution of issues in an alternative dispute resolution process. Ideas developed or proposals discussed during deliberations by either the Plenary Group or Technical Working Group, or agreements on recommendations reached in either forum and recorded in Meeting Summaries are considered to be tentative and subject to review and/or approval by the leadership of participating federal, tribal and state agencies.